



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,532	10/21/2002	Richard Jonathan Langley	10681-007	3226

20583 7590 01/18/2005

JONES DAY
222 EAST 41ST ST
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

WIMER, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/089,532

Applicant(s)

LANGLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Wimer

Art Unit

2828

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.


3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 22-37.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 20-22 and 39.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Michael C. Wimer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2828

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the antenna structure in Patin et al. is shaped to correspond to the patterns of current flow in the conduction surfaces which define the edges. Microstrip patch radiators radiate from the edges to the ground plane. A slot is formed of the electric field between the two conductors defining the patch and ground plane. Patin et al. is a good example of a patch structure where the edges 18 radiate and no significant current exists in the center region of a solid patch the size or perimeter of the edges 18. Therefore, the center region of the patch defining the edges may be "hollowed-out" or may adapt for inner patches having radiating edges 20, 24 defining a multiband radiating patch structure as defined in the claims. The shaping of the edges provide for the current flow as claimed. Further regarding Claim 39, there are non-interacting edges in the Patin et al. structure, particularly those that face each other, located about halfway between the dimension "L1". This claim language reads on such structure shown in Fig. 2(c) of Patin et al. The edges that face each other, i.e., those that do not align with the substrate edges 12, are the non-interacting edges claimed here. Thus, the rejection stands.